JX 1953
.W 53

INDIANA
UNIVERSITY

REGIONAL
CAMPUS
LIBRARY

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
INDIANA-PURDUE
NOV 1971

1/2 Ed

THE COMMON SENSE OF WORLD PEACE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/commonsenseofwpr0000hgwe

THE COMMON SENSE OF WORLD PEACE

BY
H. G. WELLS

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED IN THE REICHSTAG
AT BERLIN, ON MONDAY, APRIL 15TH, 1929

Published by Leonard & Virginia Woolf at The Hogarth Press, 52 Tavistock Square, London, W.C.1
1929

TX1953
.W53

INDIANA
PURDUE
LIBRARY
NOV 1971
FORT WAYNE

Printed in Great Britain by
Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ld., London and Aylesbury

THE COMMON SENSE OF WORLD PEACE

You have done me an enormous honour in your invitation to come and talk to you. I will not waste your time in expressing my very acute sense of my unworthiness for this opportunity of speaking to you. I have accepted it very gladly.

For some time my mind has been greatly concerned with the question of the Peace of the World. I am not exceptional in that. I am one of those people who would like to see the ages of warfare brought to an end and a new volume of human history begun. I am firmly convinced of the possibility of such a fresh beginning. I believe that mankind can and will some day live without making war at all, and that a world com-

DEC 2 1971

monweal is attainable; but I believe it can only be attained after a long and complicated struggle. It is about the nature of that struggle that I propose to talk this evening.

Will you forgive me one word of personal explanation? I believe that in 1914 I was responsible for the phrase, 'The War to End War.' In August 1914, it seemed to me that the culminating explosion of the age of armament had arrived, that the essential futility of the prevailing ideas of militant nationalism was to be demonstrated beyond dispute. And I believed it could be demonstrated in no other manner. I believed that amidst the thunder of the guns the search for *Pax Mundi* must begin. Nothing that has happened since has altered that essential conviction. That search did begin. It has begun. Our wounded and tormented but by no means exhausted world is now struggling away from the traditions of militant nationalism towards the great but still imperfectly apprehended possibilities of a *World Pax.*

I do not propose to-night to waste your time in any abstract discussion between Peace and War. To-day our world abounds in the literature of pacificism, demanding peace, even though it demands a vague and featureless peace, and denouncing every sort of armed struggle, conflict and systematic warfare. The literature exposing the vileness of war grows to great proportions. On my way here I was reading one of the latest contributions to that literature, *Im Westen Nichts Neues*, by Remarque, an altogether magnificent piece of plain clear writing. The night before I had seen in London an English play of the greatest force and power, which I hope may some day be played in Berlin, *Journey's End*, which told the same dreadful story with an altogether kindred sincerity. Never before have there been such books and such plays. Never before have the waste, the cruelty and the tragic futility of war, as we have known it, been so plainly discovered or so eloquently and copiously stated and understood, as they are being

stated and understood to-day. Never before has the will for peace been so plainly formulated or found such sustained and enthusiastic expression. I will assume that here we are all practically of one mind upon this general issue. We all think of World Peace as a thing lovely and desirable—and of war as something terrible and disastrous, wasteful and irrational. We are all seeking Peace. Even those who are doubtful whether perfect peace is ever attainable, still seek as much peace as they can. We are all desirous of erecting barriers that will endure, if possible for ever, against any return of war—war as we have known it, as it has demonstrated itself to us.

And being so unanimous, what good would there be in adding anything to-night to the vast volume of pacificist exhortation that now beats upon mankind? Let us give ourselves now to more definite questions: What precisely is this peace, this something we call peace, for which all the world appears to be clamouring? and what, in the broadest terms,

are the inevitable conditions for bringing it about? How are we progressing?—and are we progressing as fast as we should be progressing?—towards this world peace which is so much in our hearts? Are we really *getting on* towards it? Are we certainly on the right road? Or are there obstacles and difficulties which were not at first fully apprehended checking and delaying us? These are less moving and more troublesome enquiries. It is quite easy to ask for peace, like a client sitting at a restaurant table, and declare we will have nothing else but peace. It is quite easy to say, 'Take that horrible war away and bring me perpetual peace.' It is quite a different job to bring that perpetual peace. We who write and think and talk have to remember and remind the rest of the world continually that the desire for peace will no more give us peace by itself than the concentration of the mind upon hunger will nourish the body. The demand has been created and made clear and emphatic. Good. But now for criticism and

impatience. Are we doing the right things for this great end?—and are we doing enough of the right things? Or is much that is essential to the abolition of war being left undone? Have we still to open out new fields of pacificist activity and seek to pour fresh energy from sources hitherto neglected, into the task of world pacification?

Let us consider in the most general terms what is being done in the name of peace at the present time. I want to put it to you, firstly, that a great number of things that are being done and displayed and glorified as peace-seeking efforts are in actual fact rather steplike gestures than actual steps, and are taking us very little nearer, or no nearer at all, to our goal. A large part of our peace advocates are marking time—with great enthusiasm and pride and dignity, I admit—but marking time.

And secondly, I want to stress the fact that the true road to world peace is a complex and toilsome road with harsh and disagreeable corners and that many living and sensi-

tive and possibly resentful obstructions may have to be removed. Many things may need to be done that will offend influential people and that will win uncommonly little popular applause. We are facing a task vast and difficult enough to tax all the gifts and resources of mankind, a task whose magnitude the majority of us—even among the most devoted—are only beginning to apprehend; and the very prevalent persuasion that a few amiable declarations, a few amiable conferences, a Pact or so and a picnic or so, will suffice to lay the foundations of a permanent world peace is a pure delusion. A permanent world peace implies a profound revolution in the nature of every existing government upon earth, and in the fundamental ideas upon which that government is based.

Did we realize that sufficiently and is it sufficiently realized to-day? It is the hard verity towards which a number of reluctant minds are being forced at the present time.

I say 'reluctant minds,' and you see very plainly that I am suggesting that something

very fundamental, something very difficult, important and formidable, is being shirked and evaded in all this peace discussion and all these permanent peace proposals. This difficulty is the *sovereign independence of states.* That is the cardinal difficulty before us, and until we tackle it instead of walking round it and round it, we shall not make much further progress towards the organized peace of the world. We shall go on wasting our virtuous emotions upon Peace Pacts and our substance upon war preparation, just as we are doing at the present time. We shall go on accumulating explosives—on the distinct understanding of course that never, never, never do we intend them to explode. Until at last they will explode and this peace-making task will have to be suppressed for a time and then begun over again from the beginning.

I will take the Kellogg Pact of last year, and the many happy and pleasing encounters that occurred during its materialization. I will take it as typical of these popular per-

ambulations about our central difficulty. The Pact is the present culmination of a long series of proceedings on the part of citizens of the United States, since the refusal of the Senate to join the League of Nations, by which they have relieved their consciences in the matter of world affairs, without the slightest interference with their ordinary way of carrying on in life. Through that Pact all the great nations of the earth have renounced war as a method of national policy and agreed—how does it go?—that "the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever origins they may be which may arise among them shall never be sought except by pacific means." By this simple treaty, war, we are assured, has been not simply outlawed but abolished in the world.

How far this has actually been achieved can be measured by two very simple addition sums, one giving the sum of the war expenditure for 1928 of all the nations concerned before the Pact and the other the estimate for the equivalent expenditure in 1929.

That is the real index of the value of this network of peace pacts and agreements. In most countries you will discover the value is a negative one. A concrete experience of the quality of this pacificist American activity blew in through my letter-box a few weeks ago. By the same postal delivery I received, *one*, an eloquent sermon from a religious minister in Kalamazoo, Michigan, hailing the Kellogg Pact as the dawn of a new age for mankind, and, *two*, a letter from a religious minister also, an old friend who is now the pastor of an Episcopalian congregation in Texas, telling me that both the little boys I remembered when he was my neighbour in Essex were now grown-up and doing very well; one in the artillery and the other in the Gas Warfare Department in Washington.

I should be sorry if I seemed ungrateful to Mr. Kellogg and the American people for what they have done in keeping talk and aspiration about peace alive in the world. But until we recognize, and the world recog-

nizes and admits, the enormous mental vacuum that remains unfilled in such quasi-peacemaking as this Kellogg Pact, we cannot hope for any effectual beginnings of the real working organization of a world peace. This Pact was contrived by men who either do not realize at all, or who find it advisable at present not to admit that they realize, the possibility of the world being arranged in any other way than as a sort of patchwork quilt of independent sovereign states with their boundaries fixed for ever. Consequently their conception of peace is entirely controlled by that idea of integral and unassailable sovereignty. Each of these self-determining sovereign powers into which the world has been parcelled by God—assisted by the treaties of settlement now operative—is, it would seem, to go on doing what it pleases for ever, build itself in with tariffs, make itself a hotbed of epidemic diseases, cultivate a bursting charge of population or reduce its population to nothing, block interstate traffic across its territories, prohibit im-

migration or emigration, isolate itself from all foreign intercourse, and so on and so on —only now the difference is that it has promised not to make any more war. There are to be no more readjustments of boundaries, no more coalescences of sympathetic and kindred peoples—at least none are provided for. The Pact is evidently sensible of the possibility of 'disputes or conflicts' among these eternally defined sovereign states—and who could avoid seeing that?—but it sets up no authoritative means whatever for what it calls the 'settlement or solution' of these 'disputes or conflicts' in the place of the war decision which it renounces. We are, I understand, to entrust vital questions, questions like outlets for surplus population, the control of tropical raw materials, the strangulation of the industrial development of one power by another, to some miraculous type of arbitration.

The alternative possibility that these disputes or conflicts can be anticipated and prevented altogether in quite another fashion

was manifestly outside the imaginative range of the generous-spirited but most uncreative and unhelpful men who have—with the best intentions in the world—put this handsome nothingness, The Outlawry of War, so conspicuously upon the page of history.

And yet in the early experiences of the United States of America, in the spectacle of the unification of the German-speaking peoples, in the earlier consolidation of France, in the union of England, Scotland and Wales to form the British state, and in various other historical instances, we have had a variety of indications and demonstrations of just that fundamental principle which *must* be observed, if a permanent Pax is to be set up in the world. It is not as though there are no precedents to show us the futility of merely interstate agreements to avoid conflict.

The now United States bickered for years before the main lines of their federal constitution were wrought out. And if anything is plainer than another in that chapter of

American history, it is that an enduring Pax is only to be attained by *pooling sovereignty* in relation to the main causes of stress between the originally separate communities. Every step you make towards peace therefore means a loss of separateness, a loss of independence. Peace and national independence are incompatible—and our world is refusing to see it. The United States found it necessary to erect a federal government to which the control—or at least the overriding power—in matters of interstate trade, foreign trade, taxation, postal communication, money, bankruptcy, the admission of aliens to citizenship, warfare and sundry other matters were entrusted. This arrangement secured a Pax in America for half a century. It carried the American peoples through the most dangerous years of their consolidation, without war. But it left one important matter to fester, the question of the conditions under which men might be induced to labour. Over a number of states money wages were the only incentive to work permitted, and in

others slavery existed. The economic and social stresses produced by this omission led at last to a decisive civil-war, enlarging further the amount of sovereignty allotted to the federal government. There had to be the civil-war, there was no way out of that civil-war, because the federal constitution provided no other workable means of decision.

It is difficult to-day to imagine any possible stresses or conflicts in North America which the federal government of the United States of America will not be able to control and remove. But it is inconceivable that North America would not have fallen apart into a number of fragments if the original states had insisted upon remaining as they were at first, distinct sovereign countries, building up tariff walls against each other, retaining separate coinages and conducting separate dealings with the outside world.

In a nearly parallel way all of America that lies to the north of the United States, a vast region with profound racial and re-

ligious differences, speaking two languages and with the traditions of wars and conquests acute in the popular memory, a land indeed of smouldering conflicts, has achieved the secure and effective Pax known as the Dominion of Canada. The key to that peace, the only possible key to that peace, was the creation of a federal government to which even more powers were ceded than were given to the federal government of the United States.

In both cases the attempt to arbitrate and make deals between separate states and provinces did not work—that sort of thing never has worked. I venture to say it never will. There is too much possibility of friction upon each issue, too easy a way to a quarrel. In both these cases the outstanding stresses and conflicts were not litigated and adjudicated upon, but *abolished* by the creation of common interests that replaced the separate interests.

These precedents, and every precedent in which an enduring Pax has been set up, de-

monstrate the fact, which one might also infer from a general experience of the nature of man, that completely independent sovereignty is an expression of militancy and that all non-federated sovereign states are by their very independence in a condition of smouldering and accumulating contentiousness—of which war is simply the culminating outbreak. If I am right in saying that, then I am right in saying that we may sign Kellogg Pacts and Kelloggesque Pacts in Europe until there is a shortage of parchment and gold pens, and we shall have done nothing real for the peace of the world. Such things may at first propagate and encourage the peace feeling, they may have their educational value for a certain period, and that is as much as one can say for them. They do nothing to materialize and fix peace. Too much of them, too protracted a period of formal goodwill, may destroy the general belief in the honesty and good intentions of the governments that make them.

On the other hand, a zollverein spreading

out until by including the whole world it passed out of existence, or a federation of world banking and monetary controls, or a consolidation of the control of world shipping and overland transport by a federal bond, would take the world half-way towards an everlasting peace. On the day when a man—with a ton of goods—can travel from Cardiff to Vladivostok or from Moscow to San Francisco, as he can travel now from San Francisco to New York, without a passport and without a customs examination and without seeing a single battleship on the sea, a single soldier in uniform or a single warplane in the air, the chief structures of a World Pax will exist. And until he can do that, the Great Peace will still be unachieved.

But some of you will be protesting already that I am talking not common sense, but the most remote Utopianism. I am, you will say, foreshadowing a federal world state. That I admit is what I am doing. You may say, this is not practical politics.

May I dispute that? I am protesting against this flimsy Utopianism about Peace which is now so current. I admit that to get Europe out of the tariff pits in which it has buried itself and its economic prosperity, to induce all these interlocking and entangled semi-parochial national governments that divide us up to-day, to induce them to give way to broader and saner controls, and to efface the memory and tradition of ancient rivalries, means a vastly more complex effort than does getting eminent statesmen to sign peace declarations that they have not the slightest intention of observing; I admit it means indeed a propaganda and a struggle such as the world has never known before. I agree to the existence of a mountain-range of difficulties, and to the prospect of complications and set-backs beyond number on the way to a federated world peace. But that is the only real peace that is conceivable among men. Over that mountain-range of difficulties lies the way—the only way. If it is not practical politics to face difficulties, then let

us give up this pretence of ours about world peace. Let us at least drift to the next war with our eyes open. Life always has been difficult and it always will be difficult. If we do not mean to push our world over these difficulties and through these jungles, if we are not prepared to fight, and to fight not only mentally but physically, against such opponents as we shall encounter, then our peace talk is no more than talk—and we had better make our private provision for gas-masks and hiding-places and fortitude, in the disputes and conflicts that lie ahead. Is this idea of a world, federated for the control of the common interests of mankind, Utopian? Then I declare all peace-aspiration is Utopian. I have yet to learn that it is Utopian to look one's difficulties in the face instead of turning one's back on them. My reply to anyone who charges me with visionary Utopianism in my demand for the world federation of the common interests of mankind is that it is he who dreams. He is sleeping in a cramped position called

patriotism, which can produce nothing for him but a series of more and more violent and exhausting and altogether fruitless nightmares.

There are in the world at the present time two profoundly different schools of pacificist effort. They are so different that I would rather describe them as opposed to each other than as being in any sort of co-operation. They may be distinguished as the international school and the cosmopolitan school. The former school I call international because it rests fundamentally on the belief that the states and nationalities that are recognized to-day are permanent and essential human things. Consequently it seeks world peace through treaties between what it regards as the real, the innate and incurable divisions of our species. This is the prevailing school of pacificist effort to-day, the most popular, the easiest to join without any social or mental friction or distress; you can join it and abandon nothing of your habits, your position and your political associations; and

to it we owe all these beautiful and purely sentimental Pacts, Treaties, Declarations and final outlawries of war, with which we entertain ourselves until the next great war is ready to engulf us. In flat contrast to this international school of pacificism is the cosmopolitan school to which I draw your attention to-night and of which I declare myself entirely a disciple. This school thinks not in terms of states and nations but in terms of cosmopolis, the city of mankind. Cosmopolitanism is something entirely different from internationalism, it is antagonistic to internationalism. It does not see world peace as an arrangement between states but as a greater human solidarity overriding states. And it is not nearly so soft and comfortable a line of thought, and it indicates far less popular and safe and easy activities than the sentimental internationalist school. It arouses the charge of anti-patriotism at once, that charge which plays the part to-day that denunciation for heresy did in the ages of faith. To become a cosmopolitan you must

be born again. You must break away from the self-satisfied movement of the majority mind in the community from which you have arisen. You must take upon yourself the dangers—and they are great dangers—as well as the discomforts of unconventional minority thinking. And in the face of the general disapproval you have to keep hold of your conviction that this hard and even lonely road is the right way, the path to the desired reality.

The cosmopolitan may do much to sustain the faith that is in him and nerve his energies for the tasks his faith demands of him by considering the history and nature of this nationalist patriotism which now obsesses the earth, which seems now like a second nature to the greater part of mankind. And first let him reflect that it has not always been like this. Predominant as nationalism is to-day, men have not always been nationalist. I come to lecture here in a country that I find very patriotic, I come from a country deep in the same sinful condition. I spend my

winters in a third country, France, more patriotic if possible even than we are. I acknowledge and confess that I myself have this leprosy in my constitution and find it not always easy to control. And yet quite a brief time ago there were none of these patriotisms. Where was German patriotism a century and a half ago? Where was British imperial patriotism a hundred years ago? Where was English patriotism before the days of Queen Elizabeth or French before the days of Joan of Arc? There was a time, hardly more generations ago than I could count on the fingers of both hands, when our ancestors knew nothing of these tremendous demands on our loyalties, these monstrous obsessions. Men were loyal, but they were loyal to quite other things. The modern nation had yet to be discovered. We have all been so taught and trained to patriotic attitudes, they have been drummed into us from our earliest childhood, they have so impressed themselves upon us at home, at school, in book, in drama, in the common idioms of thought,

they have been so built into the substance of our minds, that it is only by a considerable intellectual effort that any of us can liberate ourselves from these forms of thought to which we have been moulded. But we *have* been moulded to them; they are not essential things. It is possible to struggle away from them and out of them, and it is still more possible to relieve the coming generations from the immense and now monstrously dangerous and evil pressure of their suggestions.

Let us recognize frankly that there is something very fundamental in man's response to patriotism. We find it very easy to fall into patriotic attitudes and very difficult to keep out of them. Children and young people tumble to patriotism very readily. Man is an adhesive beast. To stick to our group against the other group is certainly in the nature of the creature. But in a few score centuries we have seen the application of this impulse to be loyal and militant change in the most unrestricted fashion. The

group may be any sort of group. Loyalties don't care. Loyalty to the tribe has replaced loyalty to the family, loyalty to the chief has given way to loyalty to the prince, we have had men passionately loyal to hordes, to cities, to religions; the boundaries of loyalties vary enormously *and can be varied enormously.* There lies our hope. Early association, interest, suggestion and authority have shaped loyalty into a thousand various forms and may yet shape it into a thousand others. Our national loyalties to-day are so artificial that they have to be sustained by an immense conspiracy of education, suggestion, propaganda, browbeating, bullying and positive violence. The desire to protect and preserve dynastic interests and political institutions, the exaggerated fear of foreign powers and the bitter practical necessities of war preparation, have crystallized and organized human loyalty about the nationalist idea to-day—and crush us all to its mould. But what man has made man can remake, and if the real way to world peace is to be opened

out, if we are indeed to go on towards human federation, this vast complexity of patriotic teaching, emotional appeal, social and police pressure, cultivated hostility and distrust, flag waving, flag saluting and everlastingly reiterated patriotic sentiment which now divides man from man so implacably throughout the world has to be faced and fought and overcome.

There lies the essential criticism of the present structure of the League of Nations and of all these ineffective sentimental peace treaties on the part of national governments and national statesmen. Before they begin, they assume nationality as an incurable fact of human life. That is not so. And they begin by accepting the principle of intact sovereignty, and that is just what we have to begin by rejecting. President Wilson and with him the group of American nationalist pacificists who continue to play variations of his tune will some day become the subject of a penetrating study of intellectual limitation. His upbringing, his early studies, his

social and intellectual atmosphere, his professorial work and teaching will be examined in relation to his crowning exploits during and after the war. Apparently he could not think at all about world issues except in terms of organized nationality and organized political party. To that his mind had been shaped inflexibly. He thought only of nations struggling to be free. He never thought of man struggling to be free of nationality. He thought—and to-day his school of effort is still thinking—of international law when they ought to be thinking of world law. They think that war can be outlawed and abolished, and they think it can be replaced as a means of decision by litigation at some international court at which nations are to be represented as litigants. They never seem to grasp the idea that the disputes of governments may be altogether opposed to the unrepresented common interests of the peoples concerned. Their nationalism is ingrained. They have lost all sense of the forest of mankind among the

nationalist trees. And yet it was in that very America that the lesson had to be learnt that it was not the people of Connecticut or the people of New York or New Jersey that had to be thought about, but the people of the United States. And to-day it is not the Germans or the French or the British we have to think about, but mankind.

The way in which internationalism may war against human unity, the entire difference of the international from the cosmopolitan idea, has been shown in the last few years at those great gatherings of national athletes, the Olympic Games. Instead of becoming a sort of love-feast of all the people, these meetings with their displays of national symbols and national partizanship seem to intensify a vicious patriotism in both participants and spectators. They are recurrent demonstrations of the absolute unsoundness and harmfulness of the international as distinguished from the cosmopolitan idea. They exacerbate comparison and competition between nations.

Now, what forms should a real and rational movement towards the Peace of the World take? First, what must its objectives be? Neither renunciations of war nor the setting up of international leagues and associations nor the establishment of an international court will suffice. Such things do not even serve the purpose of preludes to the real organization of peace. All such things flatter and fix and confirm the sovereign state delusion. The true objective of a sincere and intelligent peace movement must be the creation of federal controls—of world-wide controls, that is to say—of at least the broad economic processes of this planet, and controls of migration and transport and health and order. To set up such world-wide controls is a complex and gigantic task. It is the task before our race. It is a very interesting and indeed exciting question into which I will not enter now, how far it can be made through existing governments or how far it may have to be made in spite of existing governments. How far

is this conception of a federal world state evolutionary and how far revolutionary? Impossible now to attempt any forecast of its forms and method of action. I will not even pretend to estimate how far statesmen, how far the progressive development of financial and business organizations outside political life, and how far popular idealism and popular passion might contribute towards the reconstruction of human affairs in the shape of that federated world control which is the only possible and rational form of world peace. Immense forces, for example all the forces that represent man's intelligent realization of the changing scale of economic processes, fight on the side of this cosmopolitan idea. In nearly every one of us, in spite of training and suppression, the cosmopolitan lurks. If politics remain nationalist still, business is being continually driven by the conditions of its development to become world business. Many businesses now are world-wide. Consider the Kodak camera. Consider the film industry. I can

imagine that there may arise a growing realization in the world and a more and more unembarrassed recognition that the sovereignty of existing governments and the loyalty we show them is provisional in its nature, and destined to give way before a federation that will abolish frontiers and make every man free of his world. In that fashion existing political activities could be turned in the direction of genuine peace and revolutionary stresses avoided. But if governments here and there take it into their heads to resist the trend in things and the drift of necessity towards world federation, if they insist upon an intense nationalism in school and press and talk, then I do not see how the attitude of sane men subjected to such governments can be anything but insurrectionary and revolutionary.

I will not discuss here, because I do not find any clear light in my own mind, how far attempts to form federations, not yet world-wide in scale, but wider than any existing sovereign governments in Europe, may

or may not serve as half-way houses towards world federation. Such ideas as the United States of Europe, Pan Europa, and so forth I will mention without any comment at all. They are extremely interesting suggestions.

Well, you will probably agree with me at once that the world is not prepared as yet for any such process of world federation as an honest interpretation of the words World Peace involves. Many people, when they say that we are not so prepared, seem to think the whole matter is disposed of for evermore. It is not. The unpreparedness of the world merely carries us on to the next question, which is to ask, Why *is* the world unprepared for the rational readjustment of its political and economic life? We have already given the answer to that. School, university, popular literature, the current thought of the time, the habits and convenience of politicians, the weight of the militant tradition, combine to resist any such preparation. And the first campaign on behalf of world peace must necessarily be a

Kultur-kampf, a fight for a new education which will supply the necessary preliminary preparation.

Now, here I am going to take a liberty with a German word and I am going to restore it to its primordial meaning. *I* have to use it because in English we have no word at all by which to translate *Kultur-kampf*. But when I use it I am not thinking at all of the struggle for the minds of the young that went on in Germany between Bismarck and the Catholic Church. I am using it simply to express a struggle, *any* struggle, to control the education of the ordinary people. I am using it in particular as to express a campaign to replace any set of fundamental social and political ideas by another set. I am using it for the effort to replace current education by a new education.

For the last century, history has been taught to larger and larger masses of the people of the world in an intensely nationalistic form. Few of us have escaped some

mental distortion in consequence. The results of that prolonged subjection to an intensive misrepresentation of human history have to be washed out of the minds of men. That can only be done by the teaching of a different history, the history of social evolution, the story of the growth of the great human society of to-day, and by the education of the imagination through a realization of man's steady conquest of power and freedom. We need a history teaching that, instead of training us to dwell upon and carry on the conflicts and resentments of yesterday and to-day, points and leads us on to the great possibilities of the collective human future. We need an education that will turn mankind from tradition to hope. That is the difficult and necessary foundation for any world peace. There is no way to world peace except through these preliminary battles in the mind.

At the present time these preliminary operations in the War to end War have still barely commenced. I see nothing develop-

ing yet upon the needful scale. On the contrary, the old mischief is still going on. At the present time the British government is giving every facility possible to the manufacturers of films that glorify warfare. And a cursory examination of the school-books in use in the British, German, French and American schools will reveal that the majority of our successors, the post-war generation, are being trained even more sedulously than we were for intenser national rivalries, intenser aggressions and intenser fears. An exaggerated partisan pride is cultivated everywhere in the all too receptive minds of the young. You may find some mention of the League of Nations in these school-books; in Great Britain we learn that the League is an excellent thing for the British Empire; but you will find not the slightest intimation of the idea of a possible world from which nationalism has been exorcised. You get not a glimpse of any suggestion of a possible time when Germany and France and England will be as much

apart and have as much in common as Westphalia and Brandenburg and Pomerania have to-day; may be as much one fatherland as are Wales and England or as Normandy and Provence and Bretagne. I suppose a schoolmaster who talked anything of the sort in any one of these three countries to-day would run a very good chance of disgrace and dismissal. Well, if we are to hope for peace in the world, all this must be changed. Until that sort of schoolmaster whom to-day we cowardly pacificists abandon almost without a protest to the patriotic wolves, is at the head of things, until these poisonous nationalist school-books have been pulped and got rid of altogether, the first step towards world peace has not been made. It is not merely a New Teaching we need; it is the suppression of an old and deadly Teaching. We have to get rid of nationalist teaching and teachers everywhere. In the cause of world peace, the tolerance of the wrong kind of teaching and the failure to defend the right kind of teaching is a crime.

But this new *Kultur-kampf* which is the necessary preliminary to the effective organization of a World Pax must go a long way beyond a mere campaign about history teachers and history textbooks. Its scope is very wide; it concerns the whole spectacle and conduct of human life. It must come to a reckoning with all forms of religious profession and activity. Are the religious organizations of the world working honestly to forward world peace? I do not think so. The existing Christian organizations must show a far livelier sense than they do at present of the unity of mankind and exert a greater pressure upon men to subordinate their patriotism to a wider loyalty, or else the new movement towards world federation will have to seek new forms in which to embody its sustaining faith. I shall not venture upon the question of what powers of renewal and adaptation may reside in Christianity and in Islam and in the other great religions established in the world. In its most generalized professions Christianity

claims to be a uniting religion for all mankind, overriding all races and kingdoms, but in practice it is closely associated with an antiquated cosmogony, a limited and partial teaching of history and also with a supple acquiescence in existing institutions and in existing governments and dictatorships, which is no doubt ascribable to its preoccupation with spiritual things. The recent agreement between the Vatican and the intensely nationalist dictatorship of Italy deepens one's doubt whether Christian statecraft has now either the will or the capacity to help very materially in the great task of world federation which lies before mankind. But can it be left out of the struggle? All the possibilities of religious concentration and devotion will be demanded of men if the immense reconstruction we contemplate is to be anything more than a dream. If a Christian Church is not for us, it is against us, and we cannot leave it alone, because we need the emotions it would monopolize for our own end.

The great religious organizations of the world may seek neutrality in the coming struggle, may be more or less obstructive or more or less helpful in the attempt to remake the mental background and the political methods of mankind, but at any rate I see no signs at present of their taking the lead in any effort to set that re-making going. Nor do I see any hope of isolated and unco-ordinated individuals setting that re-making going. It follows that if our mental backgrounds and our political methods *are* to be made over from a competitive nationalism to a World Pax, there must be a world-wide organized movement to bring it about, essentially religious and essentially new, existing primarily to bring it about and distracted by no other interests from this devotion. This means a transference of initiative in the peace movement from the casual patronage and sentimental adhesions of eminent and popular persons to men and women who are prepared quite desperately to make it the form and direction of their lives.

But where are these people and where is that movement?

Where, in the confused social and intellectual life of to-day, is the movement for world peace to find its leaders, its saints and martyrs, its banded supporters, its disciplines and concentrations of effort? To ask that question is to discover the flimsiness, the entire insincerity, of a large part of this voluminous pacificism that figures so conspicuously in the limelight of world affairs at the present time. The true movement for world peace has indeed still to begin. We are taking no effective political steps to achieve it because we have yet to make that educational revolution which must precede it. The very foundations have still to appear, and they are not appearing. Nowhere can I see any energetic and hopeful work being done upon a sufficient scale to establish these foundations.

I note this without undue despondency. The establishment of the Peace of the World will be a huge, difficult and tortuous task for

all mankind. It was inevitable that before it could be begun, in a world obsessed by nationalist delusions and prone to violent nationalist emotions, these plausible sham peace movements based on nationalist and international ideas should have their fling and flourish abundantly and expose themselves completely for what they were. Now it is possible to begin in earnest upon realistic lines.

The possibility of an organization, or a system of organizations, which may divert loyalty and devotion from patriotism to world order, and lead the way to and control a World Pax, has always played a great part in my imaginations. More than five and twenty years ago I imagined a Utopia, which was a world state, controlled by such an organization. It owed something to Plato's guardians. It owed something to our traditions of such bodies as the Knights Templars. In the days in which I wrote nothing of the kind existed in our western world, and I compared this order of self-

devoted people to the Japanese Samurai, which order had in those days taken a strong hold upon the European imagination. But since that book was written, there have been at least two demonstrations of the political effectiveness of self-devoted people banded together so as to achieve a common moral habit and discipline and concentrate upon a common purpose. We have seen all that the communist party has been able to do in the world, an organization based essentially upon the natural resentments of a state of economic inferiority, and we have seen Italy fall under the sway of the Fascisti, a banded host inspired by patriotic revolt against an exaggerated sense of national inferiority. These instances show clearly the possibility and the effectiveness of and the need for organized societies in human affairs at the present time; they indicate the laws upon which a real movement for a World Pax must develop. The immediate progress of the world towards ultimate peace and unity waits now very largely, I believe, upon

the appearance of vigorous personalities and groups of personalities, capable of transmuting the immense desire for world peace and world development which is now so widely diffused, into a lucid, organized and militant *cosmopolitan will*. To get rid of nationalism does not require us to abolish man's innate disposition towards struggle, loyalty and self-sacrifice. The peace of cosmopolis will be a new sort of conflict and a greater campaign. When I at any rate talk of a World Pax I am not asking men to cease from warfare and lapse into vacuous indolence. I am asking them merely not to waste the beautiful powers of conflict within them upon such petty things as flags and patriotic legends, but instead to battle for mighty ends and the liberation of our common earth.

I repeat I do not see any such system of organizations appearing. I feel it is in the air and in the spirit of man that such movements should appear and gather force. So I launch my poor little prophecy to that effect. For a quarter of a century I have

hoped to see such movements developing—and I still hope. But I myself am no leader nor organizer. I observe and try to spell out the writing on a page that has still to be turned in the book of history. I am addressing you without a word of appeal—much less a word of exhortation. 'Let us do it,' will follow surely enough in endless energetic minds, so soon as it is perfectly clear what it is, in sum and nature, that has to be done.

You have listened very patiently to this discourse. The gist of it is that the price of world peace in human effort, in intellectual struggle, in passion and stress, is enormously greater than is yet recognized. Common sense obliges us to recognize that it is quite possible that mankind may have neither the wish nor the will to scrape together that price and buy a new phase of existence for itself. And meanwhile, for all our Pacts and promises, the world moves plainly forward towards fresh wars. The obduracy and stupidity of my own government—in which

other governments I am less free to criticize have shared—have gradually forced back Russia, in her isolation, upon the traditions of the old nationalistic imperialism that fell in 1917. Russia through isolation is becoming once more a land of self-centred patriotism, and a vast struggle in Asia between Russia and the West, on the old exhausting, fruitless lines, is manifestly in preparation. Russia may still call it a struggle against western imperialism, but it becomes more and more plainly a struggle for the mental and physical "security" of Russia. Nothing effective is being done anywhere in the world to avert that collision. It can begin in Asia almost anywhen now and involve the whole world—needlessly, monstrously and fruitlessly. China again is a festering half-continent of war possibilities, and from Italy, throughout the re-nationalized fragments of the Austrian and Turkish Empires and so to the Near East, a score of promising war occasions are rapidly developing. It wants no toilsome peace organiza-

tions, no strenuous *Kultur-kampf*, no change in our political methods, to reap the outcome of these possibilities. A little sooner or a little later—upon our existing international basis—these latent wars will come. They will come of themselves. All we have to do for that to happen is what we are all doing now; let these things drift, sign our declarations, enjoy our sentimental occasions, and presently the guns will go off by themselves; the war censorships will stop any further talk and the drill-sergeant will kick us back into the drill-yard. If this new cycle of wars once breaks loose—this new cycle of wars which is so plainly possible—it may waste the world for a thousand years. There may be ten centuries of drill-yard before mankind. Ending perhaps in the complete destruction of the drill-yard.

That need not be. I do not despair of the world. We may win yet in our War to end War. It is going to be—as the sporting people say—a near thing. But our primary duty, if the War to end War is to

be won and we have a mind to win it, is to clear our minds of cant and delusion and face the immense complexities and difficulties and labours of the task before us, frankly and simply—as a good surgeon faces a difficult operation or an engineer faces the wilderness.

Ten years of faith-healing for the sickness of the world are enough. It is time that the issue between peace by treaty and peace by coalescence was made plain and real work for world peace begun.

DATE DUE

MAR 9 1984

AUG 1 1984

DEMCO 38-297

3 9000 015 042 448

.W53

INDIANA
PURDUE
LIBRARY
NOV 1971
FORT WAYNE

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
SLIP FROM POCKET

W8-BIE-106